

**REMARKS**

Consideration of the application is respectfully requested. Amendments have been made pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121. No new matter has been entered.

**STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1-11 are pending.

Claims 1, 6 and 9 have been amended for clarity only. Claims 3, 4, 10, and 11 have been amended to correct a typographical error.

**CLAIMS**

**Rejection under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated  
by Kojiro Yamada (GB 2 257 000 A)**

In paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-2 and 5-11 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kojiro Yamada (GB 2 257 000 A). Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Claims 1 reads as follows:

1. *A method for selecting the language in which on-screen displays are displayed and audio programs are broadcast on a receiver, comprising the steps of:*  
*accessing an on-screen display for the receiver; and*  
*selecting a language in which the on-screen displays and the audio programs are broadcast on the receiver by entering a single selection on the on-screen display.* (Emphasis added)

Yamada **does not** teach the above emphasized claim language wherein when "*entering a*

single selection on the on-screen display” the “*language in which the on-screen displays and the audio programs are broadcast*” is selected. Instead, Yamada **only** teaches “*a character display control apparatus for on-screen display of alpha-numeric or other characters in a given language selected from among a plurality of languages,*” as set forth on page 1, lines 6-8 of Yamada. Yamada describes changing the character information (alphabet and symbols) to the selected language. Yamada provides examples such as a volume-setting process beginning on page 10, line 18, whereby depending on the language, the “*term signifying volume*” is changed to the appropriate word in the language selected.

Applicant observes that Yamada describes the general operation of a television receiver that includes an audio processing circuit 19, as described in pages 5-6. However, Yamada is completely silent with regard to selecting the “*language in which ... the audio programs are broadcast,*” as claimed in the subject application. Therefore, Yamada **does not** teach providing any selection capabilities for selecting the language in which the audio programs are broadcast much less “a single selection on the on-screen display” for selecting the “*language in which the on-screen displays and the audio programs are broadcast.*”

In view of the foregoing remarks, Claim 1 is allowable over Yamada and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn. Since Claims 2-5 depend from independent Claim 1, then for the same reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 1, these dependent claims are also allowable over Yamada and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Claim 6 is similar in scope as claim 1. Yamada **does not** teach a “*means for selecting a language in which on-screen displays are displayed and audio programs are broadcast on the*”

receiver by entering a single selection on the on-screen display.” (Emphasis added.) Thus, for the same reasons as set forth above with regard to Claim 1, Claim 6 is allowable over Yamada and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn. Since Claims 6-11 depend from independent Claim 6, then for the same reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 6, these dependent claims are also allowable over Yamada and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 102(b) should also be withdrawn.

In paragraphs 4-5 of the Office Action, Claims 3-4 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kojiro Yamada (GB 2 257 000 A) in view of Hanaya et al. (US Patent No. 6,519,009 B1). Hanaya et al. was relied upon for a teaching of close captioning and teletext. However, Hanaya et al. **does not** teach “a single selection on the on-screen display” for selecting the “*language in which the on-screen displays and the audio programs are broadcast.*” Thus, the combination of Yamada as modified by Hanaya et al. **does not** teach the claimed invention and the rejection of Claims 3 and 4 under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.

**Rejection under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated  
by Shibamiya et al. (US Patent No. 5,926,174)**

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-11 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Shibamiya et al. (US Pat. No. 5,926,174). Applicant traverses the Examiner’s rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Applicant observes that Shibamiya describes a process for selecting a “*language*,” sound quality process, a  $\gamma$  selection process, etc. in columns 23-28 as shown in FIGS. 34-43. However, Shibamiya is completely silent with regard to selecting the “*language in which ... the audio*

*programs are broadcast,” as claimed. Therefore, Shibamiya **does not** teach providing any selection capabilities for selecting the language the audio programs are broadcast much less “a single selection on the on-screen display” for selecting the “*language in which the on-screen displays and the audio programs are broadcast.*”*


In view of the foregoing remarks, Claim 1 is allowable over Shibamiya and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn. Since Claims 2-5 depend from independent Claim 1, then for the same reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 1, these dependent claims are also allowable over Shibamiya and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 102(b) should also be withdrawn.

Claim 6 is similar in scope as claim 1. Shibamiya **does not** teach a “*means for selecting a language in which on-screen displays are displayed and audio programs are broadcast on the receiver by entering a single selection on the on-screen display*.” (Emphasis added.) Thus, for the same reasons as set forth above with regard to Claim 1, Claim 6 is allowable over Shibamiya and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 102(b) should be withdrawn. Since Claims 6-11 depend from independent Claim 6, then for the same reasons set forth above with regard to Claim 6, these dependent claims are also allowable over Shibamiya and the corresponding rejection under 35 USC 102(b) should also be withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks and amendments, the Applicant believes that he has overcome all of the Examiner's basis for rejection, and that this application therefore stands in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Applicant requests that he contact the undersigned attorney in order to resolve any outstanding issues without the necessity of issuing another Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

  
By: Keitseng Lin  
Reg. No. 42,804  
Phone (609) 734-6813

Patent Operations  
Thomson Licensing Inc.  
P.O. Box 5312  
Princeton, New Jersey 08540  
October 6, 2003

### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to [Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment], Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on:

10-6-03  
Date

Karen Schlauch  
Karen Schlauch